IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

WEDNESDAY, THE EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI BILAL NAZKI, THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE G.CHANDRAIAH

WRIT APPEAL No.1048 of 2005

AND

WRIT PETITION No.150 of 2004

(Writ Appeal under Clause 15 of the Letters Patent against the Order dated 21-04-2005 in W.P.No.150 of 2004 on the file of the High Court.)

Between:

Nawab Khaja Moinuddin Khan, S/o. Late Ahmeduddin Khan,
R/o. Flat No.308, Shantinagar, Hyderabad.

..... Appellant in W.A.No.1048 of 2005 and petitioner in W.P.No.150 of 2004.

AND

1. The State of A.P. rep. by Collector, Ranga Reddy District. Lakdi-ka-

pool, Hyderabad,
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella Division, Rajendranagar,

Ranga Reddy District.
3. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar, Ranga Reddy District.
....Respondents in both.

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to pass orders, positive directions or writ in the nature of Writ of Mandamus

commanding the Respondents for correcting the ownership column and possessory column in respect of the immovable property lands Sy.Nos.1 to 57 an extent of 326 acres by correcting the name of Asmanjahi Paigah myself and other share holders situated at Maktha Shamshiguda Village, Balanagar Mandal, R.R.District in the revenue records of Maktha Shamshiguda Village.

Counsel for the Petitioner/Appellant: Mr.V.VENKATARAMANA

Counsel for the Respondents : G.P. FOR REVENUE

The Court made the following :

ORAL JUDGMENT: (per Hon'ble Sri Bilal Nazki, Acting Chief Justice)

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that since the learned single Judge was of the opinion that the writ petition was not maintainable, the learned single Judge should have not proceeded to discuss the controversy on merits. Learned counsel submits that the observations made by the learned single Judge in the order may render the appellant remediless, and in these circumstances he seeks withdrawal of the writ petition along with the writ appeal. The other side has no objection.

The writ petition and the writ appeal are dismissed as withdrawn. Any observations made by the learned single Judge in his order dismissing the writ petition shall not be taken as expression of opinion on the controversy. The petitioner-appellant is at liberty to seek remedies which may be available to him in law.

_____

(BILAL NAZKI, ACJ)

8th June 2005.

(G.CHANDRAIAH, J.)

ARS

To

1. The Collector, Ranga Reddy District, Lakdi-ka-Pul, Hyderabad.
3. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Chevella, Rajendranagar, Hyderabad.
4. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Balanagar Revenue Mandal, R.R. District.
5.Two C.Cs to Govt. Pleader for Revenue, High Court Bldgs., Hyderabad (OUT).

6. Two CD copies.